SUPREME COURT, U.S.
FILED

NO. ___ 051105 JAN 27 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jeffrey Alan Olson
Petitioner,

v.

Gerald O. Williams (Attorney); United States Senate; United States Congress; & Honorable Judge Paul Magnuson);
Respondents

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jeffrey Alan Olson, pro se, 380 Bert Street, P.O. Box 536, Lake Crystal, Minnesota, 56055 Phone (507) 726-2678
for Petitioner.

April 15, 2006

The Plaintiff is asking the Court to consider the following questions, and for the protection's of such rights.

1. Is it Constitutional for a state court to have executive appointment powers in appointing guardian ad litems?

2. Is it Constitutional for a federal judge to deny rights to file cases to a citizen of the United States?

3. Is it Constitutional for a judge to disregard parental visitation rights without just cause & not remove themselves from a case where they are a defendant of the case, for Order of the case?

4. Is it Constitutional to be appointed by a jury of judges when a bench has not been filled for political reasons after Ninety days? If so what should be the criteria?

5. Is it Constitutional for a judge to be appointed by the president of the United States if the judicial branch is to be separate but equal?

6. Is it Constitutional to view foreign courts opinions on similiar cases or does this violate stari decisis?

7. Is the (3) felony conviction law Constitutional in specifics or does a felony have to broad of conviction, that rather than its intended fish bowl effect, it encompasses an ocean, and crimes are not equally due this sentence? If it is found to be unconstitutional, how should the convicted be waivered?

8. Is it Constitutional for a guardian ad litem to direct all proceedings involving medical expert witnesses?

9. Should opposing party and their attorney be held to account for damages to a party when jurisdiction was not properly obtained, which resulted in the loss of the other parties career, & visitation of children is denied for an extended period of time without just cause?

10. Should a judge have lawful

power to deny the right to the Soldiers and Sailors Act, & deny visitation of a parent in service to the country's defense?

11. Should custody of children be broken down into six year segments; which both promote the opportunity to be the primary caregiver as well as afford the opportunity for career and allow for college and vocational training?

8. Are lawfirms taking away from the ethical act of equality or even the right to a fair trial; when the other party is pro se? Should lawfirms be desolved because of this unequal balance or limited to specific allowable numbers and to only persons with a five year window after passing the bar?

9. Are the ethical boundries achieved when a judge can return to practicing as an attorney and the two clearly different responsibilities are never given true ethical seperation?

10. Should there be an organized set time limit for each case based on its crime or civil matter of law, which better organizes and allows for equal court time by all people? Should this responsibility be governed by the Supreme Court of the United States and reaffirmed every five years?

11. Should a judge be allowed the right to remove a witness if the line of questioning is out of line or not applicable to the case after ten questions?

12. Should a judge be allowed to ask at least five questions to defend or in favor of the defendant; and five questions to convict or in favor of the plaintiff, after the jury cannot come to a decision after three hours and there after be known as the ten questions of doubt?

13. Should a defendant be allowed the right to take the stand and have the

ten questions of doubt applied toward their appeal after a verdict of guilty?

14. Should the defendant lose his or her right to an appeal if they chose not to take the stand and face the ten questions of doubt, and be ordered to pay the debt, or face death, if the death penalty is so awarded without lost time or humiliation?

15. Define the reasoning behind or against adding judges to the Supreme Court of the United States?

16. Should rules be put into a hand out for all persons acting pro se, to effectively tell them the proceedures and rules especially governing mandates (like the one made available by this court)?

17. Should all law library's be opened to the public if state or federally funded and have signes posted where they are to be located at in the court?

18. Please define visitation right's? Please clearly define the responsibilities and penalties against a state for denying these rights for unlawfull reasons, without just cause?

19. Can the Guardian Ad Litem be held for damages when they refuse to apply the laws for visitation and its being denied?

20. Should the allowable time to sue be extended longer than its current state of limitations?

21. Should a state or county lose its right to practice law for a minimum of one year if it knowingly disregards the rights of people on a mass proportion based on gender, ethnic background, race, or social status, where court room policy dictates its open disregard for these rights at the state and county level, & sanctions be imposed upon sitting judges as in loss of wages?

22. Should attorney's fees be awarded

to a parties attorney who has not achieved jurisdiction in good faith?

23. If opposing party is seeking attorney's fees should a monthly statement be sent to the other party notifying them of the current total for attorney's fees?

24. Should visitation facilities be made to hold an equal gender balance within their staff to promote equality, and to discontinue gender conflict's such as restrooms?

25. Should rules for serving opposing persons be put in writting in public view of the clerk of court's public reception point?

26. Should person's serving in the military have all court proceedings heard with in the state they are currently serving or based at the time of filing?

27. Should United States Presidential Insurance be made Costitutional under new IIRS. tax formula?

28. Should the United States Congress & Senate have restrictions placed upon voting themselves raises?

29. Should United States Judge Marshals be established to insure executive oversight and protections of americans rights?

30. Should attorneys and Doctors be subject to: one year out of seven, be subject to serving under restrictions to serve Americans unable to pay fees?

(b) LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING IN THE COURT WHOSE JUDGMENT IS SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED: Petitioner (Jeffrey A. Olson); Respondents (Paula M. Zamzow); attorney (Gerald O. Williams Jr.); Lawfirm of attorney (Kissoon, Clugg,Linder & Ditberner); the state of Minnesota; Judge David M. Duffy; Bonnie Ellingboe, MA Licensed Psychologist; McCullough, Smith & Kempe P.A. Attorneys at Law; Jackie Cardinal-Guardian ad Litem; Susan Olson-Guardian ad Litem; Kay Kraus Guardian ad Litem Coordinator; Honorable Judge Bruce A. Peterson; Referee Jeannice M. Reding; Gerald O. Williams attorney At Law; State of Minnesota Honorable Chief Judge Kevin S. Burke, Honorable Chief Judge Kathleen Blatz; United States District Court Honorable Chief Judge James M. Rosenbaum, Honorable Chief Judge William H. Rehnquest; United States Senate; United States Congress; Honorable Judge Paul Magnuson; Honorable Judge Daniel Mabley; Office of the Governor of the state of Minnesota; Office of the President of the United States;

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Cover	i
Questions	ii-v
List Of Parties	vi
Table of Contents	vi
Citations	vii
Basis of Jurisdiction	vii
Constitutional Provisions	viii
Consise Statement	1a
Direct and Consise Argument	5a
Claim for Damages	1b
Appendedex	1

(d) Citations of The Official and Unofficial Reports of the Opinions and Orders:

(1) 7-29-98 Duffy, Hearing, Hennepin.
(2) 2-22-99 Kyle, Order, U.S. Dist.
(3) 4-15-99 Kyle, Order, U.S. Dist.
(4) 2-16-00, Magnunson, Order, U.S.Dist.
(5) 5-10-00, Magnunson, Order, U.S.Dist.
(6) 7-27-00, Magnunson, Order, U.S.Dist.
(7) 12=7-00, Order of Beam, Fagg, & Loken.
(8) 3-5-01, Writ of Cert. filed.
(9) 1-26-01, Order Dir. of Court.
(10) 12-29-03, Peterson Order Henn.
(11) Dec-03, Ellingboe Opinion.
(12) 01-30-4, Order Judge Burke.
(13) 03-2-04, Reding-Peterson Order.
(14) 04-28-04, Reding-Peterson Order.
(15) 05-28-04, Reding-Peterson Order.
(16) 06-10-04, Peterson Order.
(17) 09-10-04, Opinion Guardian.
(18) 09-10-04, Opinion Guardian.
(19) 06-24-04, Magnuson Order.
(20) 09-1-04, Court Ord. Psch. Eval.
(21) 10-19-04, Peterson Order.
(22) 12-10-04, Opinion report Guardian.
(23) 12-28-04, Order Dir. C. Sletten/Duda
(24) 02-9-05, Letter Guardian.
(25) 01-15-05, Order Dir. of Court.
(26) 05-09-05, Dir. of Court
(27) 07-31-05, Guardian Report.
(28) 09-2-05, Mabley Order.
(29) 02-02-05, Order Davis.
(30) 10-20-05, Bye, Mcmillion, & Riley.
(31) 12-22-05 Order Dir. Of Court.
(32) 01-20-06 Order Dir. of Court.

(e) STATEMENT OF THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION IN THIS COURT IS AS FOLLOWS:

(i) Judgment is sought to be reviewed in case 05-1615 Olson vs. Williams Filed: December 22, 2005, from the Eighth District Court of Appeals. The Appeals court has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power.

(iii) The docket fee will be included as a money order located in the U.S. Express box. Plaintiff will serve defendants as is understood by the question and inform them of writ via county sheriffs department & or Certified Mail.

(iv) The statutory provision which confers on this court jurisdiction are as follows: [Fed. R. Civ. P. 35, 52, & 59; 28 U.S.C. & 1254; Lr 24.1; 28 U.S.C 2403 Article I, II, & III Amendment I, IV, VIII, IX, X, & XIV. (Procedure for notification of any claim of UnConstitutionality).

(v) The notifications will be made to the department of justice at or before the time of service.

(f)

(1) Soldiers' & Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, an act to promote and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval establishments, including the Coast Guard. 50 U.S.C. Appendex 501 et seq,; stat. 1178 (1940) as subsequently amended.

(2) Qualifications of visitation and custody.

(3) JURISDICTION:

Summary of jurisdictional law: initial determinations and modifications.

(g) That this case is of such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellative practice and to require immediate determination in this court as in U.S.C. & 2101 though appellate proceedings are met. The Eighth circuit Court also believed that the Respondent would never persue his rights in the upper court. The state of Minnesota took jurisdiction with out meeting statutory guidelines in the state court, & never cared what the result or consequences of their actions displayed in court

would be. Since taking jurisdiction the actions of the courts both state and federal but more state; has been a cooperative effort to degrade, humiliate & provoke an uncivilized display which could then be actionable against Mr. Olson.

(i) The Respondent let the attorney whom he hired, to argue jurisdiction and move the case back to California, but he failed and was dismissed of his duties. The Respondent then argued the case pro se and moved upon the court that jurisdiction would continue to be an issue, because Mr. Olson lost his career and was not receiving visitation. The court assumed jurisdiction anyways and proceedings continued and Mr. Olson was deneid his rights and harrassed from that point forward.

Federal questions of Constitutional rights were raised in every hearing in front of the court, & listed in the appendex. But no action or protection of rights has ever been acted upon by judicial officers sworn to uphold the United States or Minnesota Constitution.

CONSISE STATEMENT:

This case was brought to the state of Minnesota from the state of California under false affidavits by the Petitioner in the dissolution case 216900. The Honorable Judge Duffy suppressed evidence at trial, that Ms. Zamzow held a valid California Drivers license. The Honorable Judge Duffy also mocked the evidence and mislead the argument by characterizing the auto insurance report verifying Ms. Zamzow's California license as an "application for a license" in his Order. The Honorable Judge Duffy went to great extent for reason's unknown, to cover up the residency of Ms. Zamzow. But Judge Duffy gave no care to the display of impropriety's; to the extent that Ms. Zamzow's Sister "Susan Zamzow," at the time an attorney licensed in Minnesota and Ms. Zamzows' attorney Mr. Williams both appeared coming from the judges chambers together prior to hearings "as a meeting of the minds," on several occasions; during proceedings. Often during proceedings the judge would look in the direction of Ms. Zamzows table and remind them where he would be located at & put this in their Order's. The Guardian ad Litem would secretly talk to Ms. Zamzows attorney and the judge; right in front of everyone. There simply appeared to be no care at all, the state bar and the judge's involved in these state dissolution cases was overwhelming with appearing bias! But this seemed to be a strategy to try to get this plaintiff to be outraged and overreact. Their strategy certainly appeared to try to implement some evidence of their psychological evaluations and get a display of paranoid reaction. But this plaintiff was to disciplined, after all I was a Marine. What struck this Plaintiff the

most was how they didn't seem to have any concept, that what they were doing was wrong and would insight violence if directed at a person without the discipline maintained by this Plaintiff
Aside from this case, when a judge operates family court like this, does it really end there? Does this disregard carry over and embolden the judge to violate rights beyond the civil court? Federal District Court judges see nothing wrong to the extent, their prejudice against the plaintiff for filing such an outrage against a judge. But who is watching the judge in family court? Obviously nobody is, and judge Duffy knows that; it belongs to the states! When asked all federal judges responded; they'll tell you we do not want any part of it, that is a state matter!

Because a lot of lives can be saved, certainly hope this Court takes these violations serious; its a state matter, but the people must have federal supervision. Then, the Honorable judge Duffy and the attorney's would have to watch themselves; because the Constitution says were here to protect the people. Judge Duffy also suppressed evidence where Mrs. Olson had snatched the children from the home in California without Mr. Olson's knowledge and Petitioned the court in Minnesota claiming she was a resident of Minnesota.

The Petitioner Ms. Zamzow had not lived in the state of Minnesota for the required time for residency. Mrs. Olson had brought the minor child for visitation with marks of abuse several times hoping that the Respondent would receive the child without question and upon returning the child, the marks would then be addressed for abuse against the Respondent These police reports were suppressed also by the judge not in favor of (Mr. Olson).